



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/528,678

03/20/2000

Albert M. Chan

MIT8755

5588

7590

11/19/2004

Samuels Gauthier & Stevens LLP

Matthew E Connors

225 Franklin Street

Suite 3300

Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER

ODOM, CURTIS B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2634

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/528,678	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Curtis B. Odom	<b>Art Unit</b> 2634	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
**ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
 2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
     (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
     (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
     (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
     (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Attachmentt.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
 7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-32.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
 9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment to the claims filed on 9/29/2004 has not been entered because the insertion of an “anticausally and casually” filtering operation raises new issues that would require further consideration and search.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant states that “It is assumed that Lee (U. S. Patent No. 6, 570, 919) is not concerned with removing ISI in a nonlinear fashion. However, the invention relies on the nonlinear removal of ISI to significantly enhance system performance. Therefore, Lee ‘919 does not anticipate claims 1, 17, 15, and 31, and thus is allowable.” However, it is the understanding of the examiner that Lee ‘919 is concerned with removing ISI in a nonlinear fashion. In column 1, lines 32-40, Lee states “DFE (Decision Feedback Equalization) is a nonlinear method that utilizes previous decisions to cancel trailing ISI in the currently detected channel sample”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that since the device of Lee applies DFE and utilizes previous decisions to cancel trailing ISI that the ISI removal of Lee is performed in a nonlinear fashion based on the definition of DFE stated by Lee above (column 1, lines 32-40).

Art Unit: 2634

***Conclusion***

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Curtis B. Odom whose telephone number is 571-272-3046. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on 571-272-3056. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Curtis Odom  
November 12, 2004

  
**STEPHEN CHIN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**